P
5 Hist
P

THE PATRIOT

No. 16.—Vol. II. 25 MAY, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

REVOLUTIONARY PORTRAITS—See page 5.

By NESTA H. WEBSTER.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
A Mess of Red Pottage	1	The Outlook in Ireland	12
Notes of the Week	3	Incidents of the Irish Terror	14
Revolutionary Portraits—No. II.	5	Correspondence—	
Communist Terrorism	7	The Clergy and Bolshevism	14
How Germany Ought to Pay	8	The Red Death	14
Propaganda in America	9	Budget Secrets	15
Letters of a Patriot—IX.	9	Soviet View of the Genoa Conference	15
Unreported Conversations	10	Socialist Sunday Schools	15
The Genoa Fiasco	11	The Need for the Truth	15

All communications for the Editor or Manager to be addressed to—The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.

LIBRARY
NOV
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

A MESS OF RED POTTAGE.

History repeats itself—with a difference. There was a time once before when England was trying hard to open up a trade with Russia. It was in the brief but brilliant reign of Edward VI., whose Government swept away the privileges of the German merchants, and helped to break the monopoly which had kept England the slave of the Hanseatic League throughout the Middle Ages. True, the privileges were restored by Queen Mary; but Queen Elizabeth went back to the policy of her brother, and with the help of her own merchant adventurers, broke the German maritime and mercantile power.

It is a long story; that part of it which concerns Russia would make an epic in itself. The Baltic was closed to our merchants by the German naval power, and the Russian trade was completely in the hands of the Hanseatic cities. "But by reason," says Chancellor, "that they used the like ill-dealings there which they did with us, they lost their privileges, restitution whereof they earnestly sued for at the time that our men were there." Our Merchant Adventurers, seizing this opportunity, formed the subsidiary Russia Company (which was formed in 1551), and they trusted Sebastian Cabot so far as to break their rule against the admission of foreigners, and make him Governor of the Company. This they did because Cabot put before them a daring plan for circumventing the enemy. They would sail to Russia by way of the North Cape.

Our daring English sailors thus broke the German blockade and forced their way into Muscovy by way of Archangel, although the gallant Sir Hugh Willoughby and his whole ship's company died in the attempt. Chancellor struck south from the Bay of St. Nicholas, reached Moscow, and obtained a licence to trade from the Emperor Ivan the Terrible. The Company with this licence laid the foundations of our trade with Russia, and that real friendship which has subsisted (with intervals) ever since. For the Russians always looked upon England as a happy alternative to the economic yoke which Germany was always seeking to fasten upon their necks. In 1554 one of the agents of the Company wrote that the Germans had recovered their privileges by wholesale bribery: "It was reported to me by a justice of that country that they paied for it thirtie thousand rubbles." To German bribery and monopoly the English merchant opposed fair dealing. Thus in the Russia Company's trading instructions of 1557 we find these maxims of good commerce:—

> For we must procure to utter good quantitie of wares, especially the commodities of our realme, although we affoord a good peny worth, to the intent to make other that have traded thither, wearie; and so to bring ourselves and our commodities in estimation, etc.

These English merchants of the Elizabethan age and their struggles to fight German influence in Russia—have they any lessons for us now, when we are fighting what is evidently a losing game against Germany for the same trade?

Let us see. The problem, obviously, has several differences. Ivan the Terrible was a good Russian. He hated the Germans and turned them out

of his kingdom when they abused their privileges. But the Government in Russia to-day is allied with and probably under the thumb of Germany. Have we already forgotten the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk? Can we ignore the extraordinary revelations made by Mr. Edgar Sisson in his report to a Committee of the American Senate? If we could rule out these we should still have to remember the recent "bombshell" exploded at Genoa, which, in fact, should have startled nobody, since it was all of a piece with everything that has happened. We may also take it for granted that there is truth in the report of a military agreement between Germany and Russia, since it is the natural complement of the Treaty.

We take it, then, that the so-called Soviet Government is tied to Germany. All those wonderful Communist principles are no more than a handful of cayenne pepper to be thrown in the eyes of Western Europe. It has been said truly that Communism is the spear-point of German capitalism. It has been so at least since the days of Karl Marx, who, there is very good reason to suppose, was a paid agent of the Prussian Government. The French believe that he got £10,000 for his work in fomenting strikes and revolutions in France during the Franco-Prussian War; but his work in pushing England into the Crimean War and undermining our industrial system was no less important to Prussian policy.

If the Bolsheviks are the creatures of Germany, we can hope little from Russia until they are removed. Such is the conviction of the United States. Such is the conviction of France and of Belgium. But Mr. Lloyd George is of another opinion. He has tried to persuade the United States and to coerce France into his policy of supporting the Bolsheviks, and has been rewarded with the German-Russian Treaty—a treaty which threatens not remotely the very existence of Western Europe.

It may be said that Mr. Lloyd George tried the other policy and failed. Like the English merchants of the sixteenth century, he sent an expedition to Archangel, and he supported Denikin and Koltchak. But we venture to say that these attempts were not whole-hearted. We doubt if they were even meant to succeed. We see through them all that "vein of treachery" which we trace everywhere under the skin of British foreign policy. The Archangel attempt was a costly imposition on the British public. And it was costly for the unfortunate Russians, also, for when we withdrew, thirty thousand of our friends in that region were massacred by the Bolsheviks. That dreadful tragedy has never been made known. We might compare it with the massacre of the Loyalists in Ireland—a blood-offering on the altar of British policy.

There may have been no sense in continuing the Archangel experiment when both the Baltic and the Black Sea were thrown open to us by the collapse of Germany and of Turkey. But we should —and we could—have seized that opportunity to replace on the throne of Russia a monarch friendly to the Allies—and beloved (as was the Tsardom, with all its faults) by the Russian people. We let that golden opportunity slip. We allowed the German-made tyranny of sham Communism to consolidate itself. We permitted the massacre of our friends in Russia, as we are permitting the massacre of our friends in Ireland. We might, in the anarchy then prevailing, with Germany prostrate, have secured peace and good order for Russia and the gratitude of a great nation? What prevented us? German and Jewish propaganda and influence, working on the ignorance and folly of our politicians.

We might—in the opinion of experts—have then saved Russia with a division of good troops. We had, besides, the offer of Japanese intervention, which we refused. But if this policy were too ambitious for our strength there was an alternative.

We might have returned to a warlike and organised commerce, such as Englishmen created in the days of the Tudors. Such a national company as the Russia Company or the East India Company, handling the whole capital engaged in its particular trade, and supported by the power of the nation, might have established itself in some selected and fortified port either in the Baltic or the Black Sea. Such an outpost of Western capitalism would have acted like a patch of healthy skin in the injured tissues of Russia. It would have formed a centre of freedom, of civilisation, and of trade which would gradually have extended itself and created its own territories. In this matter we might have acted in co-operation with America and France. We could have made ourselves secure by our sea power in the selected port and gradually extended our land power as opportunity offered. Then we should have given our friends in Russia a hope and a centre of activity and propaganda. It was in such a way that we intervened upon the anarchy of India, and ended by giving a great territory peace and good government. But such a policy demands a Government whole-hearted in the cause of British industry and British commerce—a Government also that understands the traditions of its own country and has the courage and the imagination to carry through a great stroke of policy.

As it is, we have lost a great opportunity. We have played a double game—which is usually a losing game—pretending to encourage while actually betraying our friends in Russia, and secretly acquiescing in the German scheme to enslave and exploit that great country. The enslavement and the exploitation may have consequences fatal to the British Empire. For Germany has the industrial power and the military genius to organise and develop the man-power and the native resources of Russia into an engine of destruction formidable both on land and sea. Why not? She has little to lose and everything to gain by the experiment. Our Prime Minister has obligingly given her a truce of eight months, during which she can set to work and get her organisation so far advanced as to make intervention impossible. What have we gained to counter-balance this tremendous advantage to Germany and danger to ourselves? The friendship of the Bolsheviks! A mess of red pottage!

NOTES OF THE WEEK.

The Failure of Genoa.

Everyone who is not bemuddled by admiration for Mr. Lloyd George admits that the Genoa Conference has been an utter failure. The *New Statesman*, which represents the Fabian and Labour Socialists, states, 20 May, that the Genoa Conference "has been a fiasco quite without precedent in international history. We were never sanguine of its prospects . . . but we did not suppose that its record of achievement would be quite so empty as it has proved." It adds that The Hague agreement is "a very thin covering" of the Genoa failure, and it does not anticipate that the difficulties which have paralysed the Genoa negotiations will be removed, or even lessened, before The Hague meeting."

"The Entente is Dead."

Turning to the effect of the Genoa negotiations on the Entente, the *New Statesman* remarks: "To say that the Entente is dead is no longer to express a wish or an opinion, but merely to state a quite obvious fact." It agrees with the Coalition Press that France is intransigeant, and that for the present we shall have "to proceed as if it (the Entente) did not exist." But the *New Statesman* does not (like the Downing Street organs) lay all the blame on France. It condemns the methods of the Premier's Bolshevik friends. The failure of Genoa, it declares, "is at least as much due to the impossibilism of M. Tchitcherin as to the impossibilism of M. Poincaré. For the Bolsheviks to demand material assistance and enormous credits without offering any really effective recognition of the rights of private property in Russia is obvious nonsense." If our Coalition Government could be persuaded to regard this Bolshevik attitude as "obvious nonsense" it might save this country from further humiliation and dishonour.

The German-Bolshevik Alliance.

The *Communist*, 20 May, publishes an article on "The Results of Genoa," written by Comrade C. M. Roebuck. Referring to the Russo-German Treaty, the writer says:

> Already the Treaty of Rapallo has created a significant move of German machinery and technical skill into Russia; over 100 contracts and concessions of various kinds, but all involving credits, are under consideration at the present time by the Soviet Government. On April 30 the first passenger aeroplane of the New Berlin-Moscow service landed on the Vhodinka fields, and next day participated in the aerial manœuvres which formed part of the great national proletarian holiday.

After reviewing the progress made by the Soviet delegates at Genoa, Comrade Roebuck concludes by saying that:

> For those who are working for the emancipation of the proletariat, first among them, the Communist Party, the task is clear; by a conscientious and persistent application of the policy of the "United Front," decided upon in Berlin to thwart the malevolence and aggression of the Imperialists, to relieve the pressure upon the exhausted workers and peasants of Russia once for all, and thereby to secure the first big victory of world Labour over world Capitalism.

The policy of the "United Front," decided upon at the meeting of the three International at Berlin, will no doubt be continued, despite the truce pact of our extraordinary and versatile Premier.

The Attacks on France.

The Prime Minister's own press throws a light no less lurid upon the results of Genoa. Take, for example, this virulent attack upon France by Mr. J. L. Garvin in the *Observer* under the guise of supporting a movement towards disarmament:

> Ceasing to hold a veto over the reunion of civilisation by a unique monopoly of militarism based on black levies—over three hundred thousand on a peace footing, with a plan of a million in war—France must disarm or the rest must rearm. . . . Now, as in the past, the equipped ascendancy of a single Power, holding up the desires and interests of nearly all the others, cannot be tolerated. That is the question which has loomed larger and larger in the background of Genoa.

Considering that the British Empire has also got armies black and brown, the hypocrisy of this sort of talk is as obvious as its folly.

"Reaction"—against What?

It will be noted with what gusto Mr. Garvin uses the catchword "Reaction," which he must have picked up when he dined with Chicherin and the other Red comrades in Italy. But Mr. Lloyd George has also found the "slogan," and uses it with equal relish in an interview which appeared in the *Sunday Times*. The interviewer was so rash as to suggest to the Prime Minister that Genoa had been a "fizzle," which, as we are not surprised to learn, produced a "sharp" retort. So far from being a fizzle, Mr. Lloyd George replied, Genoa was the first victory in a campaign against "reaction." Reaction in Bolshevik language describes any movement of people or nations who "react" against the imminent danger of having their throats cut, their property destroyed, and their women dishonoured by the Red armies. France also is no doubt "reactionary" because she reacts against the terrible menace of a German-Bolshevik alliance.

Support for Bolshevism.

Professor Keynes, in a letter to the New York *World* of 7 May, states:—

> I have already expressed the opinion that Great Britain would be acting in her own and in the general interest if she were to accord to Russia a strong Government credit for a substantial amount. Mr. Lloyd George is believed to sympathise with this view. But his Chancellor of the Exchequer and perhaps his Cabinet as a whole are decidedly opposed. This act in the play, therefore, must be set in London. If Mr. Lloyd George is not allowed by the Conservatives to increase his present intangible offers of cash assistance, his prospects of squaring M. Tchitcherin are decidedly remote.

If this view is correct, the Prime Minister was apparently willing to grant British credit for the maintenance in power of the greatest criminals the world has produced, and for the continuance of a *régime* which renders the recovery of Russia impossible.

More Terrorism.

The Communist Press continues to publish reports of acts of terrorism by members of the Communist Party in various parts of the country. In the *Communist* of May 20, Mr. J. T. Murphy, the notorious shop steward of Sheffield, writes on the Engineers' Lockout. Comrade Murphy is one of the officials of the British Section of the Red International of Labour Unions, and he is also a member

and leader of the Communist Party. In his article in the *Communist*, Murphy states that

> Following on the efforts of the Sheffield workers to stop the non-federated firms, the London workers are moving strongly to stop the utility services, to cut off effective supplies, to involve larger and more effective forces. That is the way to bring to a successful issue.

Continuing, Comrade Murphy, of the Red International, announces that

> Barrow is an example to the rest of the country. No work is being done at Barrow, and the Barrow men are absolutely solid and disciplined. They stand against the police and bosses as a solid mass. We hear from Barrow: Huge demonstrations and mass picketing take place daily, and there are remarkable demonstrations of men and women marching in formation under the control of specially appointed officers. Workmen's trains are held up each day and intending strikebreakers pulled out.
>
> The article concludes by advising the workers to get a move on and urge the union executives to call out the workers from the public utility services, cut off the electric supply, stop the power stations, draw out the men from the sewage works, compel the authorities to waken up and bring Sir A. Smith to order.

In support of those demands, the placard of the *Communist* contains the words, "Cut off the Juice." But why worry about this terrorism? Mr. Lloyd George has arranged a truce with Bolshevism at Genoa! If you doubt it, see Mr. Garvin.

A Timid Organisation.

These reports suggest that unless our manufacturers are prepared to fight the Terrorism, they may as well put up their shutters. Unfortunately they are both divided and badly led. Take, for example, the attitude of the Federation of British Industries, which was started with a great flourish of trumpets to represent and protect the manufacturing interest. At a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the F.B.I., the Sheffield members asked if the Federation intended to take any steps to urge the Government to repeal the Trades Disputes Act. A Sheffield representative pointed out the tyrannical manner in which mass picketing was being used in the engineering dispute. The President, Colonel O. C. Armstrong, doubted whether this was a class of subject which could be dealt with by the Federation, but suggested that a sub-committee should be appointed to consider the matter. Sir Peter Rylands supported the President, and said that the sub-committee would first have to consider whether a *prima-facie* case against the Trades Disputes Act had been made out! Considering that British industry is at the present moment being garrotted by the use, or abuse, of the Act, that question might surely have been taken for granted. Sir Peter even suggested that the question was beyond the Federation, which only "dealt with broad questions of a social type affecting Labour generally." The truth is that the Federation is tied by subtle bonds to the Coalition, and fears to do anything which might discommode the Government. It had the inestimable privilege of being invited to take part in the Genoa Conference, and its industrial magnates are no doubt deluding themselves with vain dreams of industrial concessions, which, as a matter of fact, are safely in the pockets of Herr Rathenau and his Germano-Jewish friends.

The Need for a Leader.

Our manufacturers have been seduced into support of Mr. Lloyd George, who has no intention of modifying the Trades Disputes Act. The Prime Minister is too keen on securing the support of the Labour Party in Parliament to do anything which might antagonise the Labour vote. But the Federation of British Industries has been controlled from the start by a small group of employers—the chief of them being Mr. Godfrey Isaacs and Sir Peter Rylands—who do not believe in protection for British industries, but are international in their outlook. Sir Peter Rylands' proposal that Germany should pay her indemnity in manufactured goods is characteristic of Federation policy. What the British manufacturers require, but have not got, is a leader, a party, and a policy founded on the industrial interest of this country.

The Truce against Britain.

The Irish Truce between Michael Collins and De Valera took place after our Irish Letter was written. But its nature is suggested by our correspondent, for he draws attention to the real weakness of the "Provisional Government," which made inevitable this surrender to the more truculent and violent minority. The Irish people desire peace, but the Irish Republican Brotherhood and its army want war. And they mean to have it, not only against Ulster, but against Great Britain. The truce is in reality a surrender to Republicanism, and it is common knowledge that the "Dominion" idea—which never had much life—is dead in Ireland. Collins has made peace with his rival on a Republican basis—so much is certain. The British Government are again "up against it."

The Attack on Ulster.

Another and undisclosed part of the truce was, we may be certain, a concentration upon Ulster. The two brigands have sunk their mutual animosities to throw the weight of their "armies" upon their northern border. These "armies" are made more formidable by the gift of arms and transport by the British Government, through its creature, Mr. Cope. The Ulster Government are forced into a defensive and, therefore, weak policy by the waiting, not to say equivocal, attitude of the British Government.

The State of Ireland.

Ireland is rapidly falling into a state of Bolshevism. The flames and smoke of burning mansions make the night lurid, and murder and robbery are done in broad day without anyone daring to protest or interfere. Here is a little extract from the letter of a soldier's wife in Munster written on May 17 which gives a vivid impression of the prevailing disorder :—

> . . . the people are so frightened that when a funeral is passing one is afraid to tell the other who is dead. The children going to school have revolvers in their pockets now. The country is in a terrible state. When is it going to be right again? . . .

The Refugees.

Little wonder that loyalists, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, are crowding over in increasing numbers. We are glad to hear that a Registration Bureau has been opened at 64, Victoria Street, to register cases of refugees and claimants. Devoted workers are now compiling a register of claims, and both refugees and claimants are advised to get into touch with the Bureau. Those who are organising the Bureau are also making arrangements to hold a meeting in London to consider what is best to be done.

Owing to pressure on our space we regret we are compelled to hold over further extracts from Mr. Edgar Sisson's Report on the German-Bolshevik Conspiracy.

REVOLUTIONARY PORTRAITS.—II.

DANTON.

By NESTA H. WEBSTER.

Of all the legendary figures looming through the red mist of the first French Revolution, none is more dear to that portion of the British public which still remains "under the thraldom" of Carlyle than that of "the brawny Titan," Georges Jacques Danton. To reveal the cold facts about this cherished idol of modern "democracy" is to bring about one's ears a storm of criticism from the Press which shows how firm a hold the traditions of that stormy period have taken on the British journalistic mind. The truth is abhorrent to it. Completely out of touch with Continental thought, it clings to its old formulas, sublimely unconscious that they are at least twenty years behind the time. Thus the "Times Literary Supplement," in criticising my book on the French Revolution, made the ridiculous statement that "the view of Danton as a hired voluptuary is the *rechauffé* of an old legend"! One wonders how much of the controversy which has raged in France on the venality of Danton this dogmatic authority had studied!

The True Danton.

As a matter of fact, the legend of Danton consists in the theory that he was *not* venal—an idea that seems to have occurred to few people during his lifetime. In the opinion of his contemporaries, belonging to all parties—Royalists, Girondins, and Robespierristes alike—to the Republican Lafayette and the democrat Prudhomme, Danton's dominant characteristics were his love of money and pleasure. Nor in his own day does he appear to have been regarded as the "colossal figure" portrayed by Carlyle. Prudhomme speaks with evident amusement of the fact that Fabre d'Eglantine actually looked on Danton as "a great revolutionary hero." His massive and hideous countenance, with the squat nose, the wide cheek-bones, the heavy jowl and thick lips—the upper one scarred and disfigured by a thrust from a cow's horn in his childhood—lent him a terrifying appearance which, combined with his powerful lungs and violent oratory, ensured his success at street corners and in the revolutionary clubs; but as a statesman he was merely grotesque. M. Aulard rightly points out that he had no political system; but for the position of authority he eventually occupied he would hardly have been taken seriously. At worst, a vulgar and brutal agitator; at best, an eloquent crowd magnetiser, with the trick of catching the popular ear, or rousing enthusiasms, capable of generous sentiments, Danton was, in a word, a personality, a power—yet a power on whom no one could depend, for no one knew by what influences it would next be swayed. Such, at any rate, was the general opinion current at the time. The verdict of contemporaries may be mistaken, but it cannot be described as a "legend."

The Revolution left the French people under no illusions about Danton, for, during the fifty years that followed, the revolutionary elements amongst them lay almost entirely under the spell of Babouvisme; it was the Robespierriste tradition, revived by Babeuf, continued by Buonarotti, maintained with ardour by Buchez and Louis Blanc, and restored to its pristine violence by Blanqui, that stirred the hearts of French Revolutionary Socialists and their disciples amongst the working classes. The legend of Danton as a mighty patriot and revolutionary hero did not therefore find expression in France until the middle of the nineteenth century, when Michelet published his fantastic history of the period. But a few years later a counterblast was provided by Granier de Cassagnac, who, in his "Histoire des Causes de la Révolution Française." mercilessly shattered Michelet's idol, and in a series of realistic portraits admirably described the difference between the two Dantons—on the one hand, the Danton of revolutionary tradition, "a sort of athletic gladiator, passionate and audacious," whose "glance set all hearts on fire," whose eloquence carried everyone away, who had emitted that Titanic roar which shook the caverns of the Faubourgs," and, on the other hand, "the real Danton, a mediocre lawyer, garrulous and cowardly, who kept carefully away from the tumults his ambition had provoked, and waited in hiding for the imbeciles he had driven into the streets to win for him a Ministry or Dictatorship." As soon as Danton appeared in the midst of the fray one could be sure that all danger was over—"this warlike attitude announced the calm as the swallow announces the springtime."

But in spite of Granier de Cassagnac the legend of Danton persisted; continued by Bougeard in 1861 and by Robinet in 1865, it found a further exponent in the Socialist Jaurès, whilst even M. Louis Madelin allowed himself to fall partially beneath its spell.

Was He a Patriot?

Now personally I yield to no one in admiration for M. Madelin. He belongs to that new school of French scientific historians whose method our own country would do well to imitate. The old dishonest habit of suppressing truths inconvenient to the author's theories has been abandoned; M. Madelin in his admirable history of the French Revolution, and also in his life of Danton, displays throughout the utmost good faith—nothing is concealed, nothing is distorted in order to glorify the objects of his admiration, and if we cannot always agree with his conclusions, we can always be sure that he has dealt honestly with facts. Briefly, then, M. Madelin's attitude to Danton is this: Danton was in all probability venal; he was "perhaps an agent of the Duc d'Orléans," "that miserable prince"; he facilitated the massacres of September and boasted cynically of the fact. "Impulsive . . . passionate, violent, more audacious than persevering . . . making a flourish more of vice than virtue . . . always ready to weep tears of blood over the disasters that his words have unloosed." Yet M. Madelin forgives Danton all this because he sees in him a patriot—the saviour of France from the advancing armies of the Austrians and Prussians.

But M. Madelin's work is by no means the last word on Danton, nor is it the latest. Reviewers in this country who recently hailed its translation in English as quite a new view of the subject were evidently unaware that since its publication in France eight years ago a very remarkable reply had been made by M. Albert Mathiez to Danton's "indulgent biographer." It should be noted that M. Mathiez is a Radical Socialist, and cannot therefore be accused of writing in the interests of "reaction"; yet he confirms every word I said on Danton's intrigues in my "French Revolution," which appeared before M. Mathiez's book, so that I was unable to refer to the important evidence he

brought forward. In "Danton et la Paix" M. Mathiez shows Danton then not only accepting money from whoever would pay him—enriching himself in Belgium, betraying the cause of Republicanism in the interests of the Duc d'Orléans, but even making overtures to the Breton Royalists in case the Coalition proved victorious. As to his patriotism, so vaunted by M. Madelin, M. Mathiez confirms in detail my assertion that Danton never hesitated to avail himself of foreign aid when it could serve his interests. From August 10 to October 10, when Danton was in power, "he showed himself to be much preoccupied in ending the war by negotiation. After Valmy he had facilitated the retreat of the Prussians, sought to obtain an alliance with them, and made offers to England to maintain her neutrality." "We have read the ministerial correspondence, we have seen that there was an abyss between the sonorous declarations of Danton in the Tribune and his

Portrait of DANTON.
Drawn by David. (Musée de Lille; Photo. Braun.)

secret acts which belie them." The only unity in the conduct of Danton throughout consists in the fact that, "whether in the Ministry or the Opposition, he thinks only of his personal interests, and seeks to draw from events the largest possible amount of profit for his ambition and cupidity. . . ." But where, as M. Mathiez pertinently inquires, "where in all this does France come in? Or the Republic? And in what words can we describe such conduct?"

So much for Danton's patriotism. What, then, of his "great heart" referred to by Carlyle? Garat declared that during the Massacres of September, which Danton himself had instigated, he tried to save victims on all sides. It is probable that he did effect the rescue of two personal friends, that on other occasions he made further attempts of the same kind, usually for money—according to Lord Acton he would even have saved the King if it had been made worth his while—sometimes, indeed, he appears to have done so from pure good nature. Beaulieu, who knew him well, put the matter concisely in the words: "Danton liked to exterminate human beings in the mass and to do them service individually." But he was certainly never known to face the smallest personal danger for the gratification of this fancy.

At the same time, Danton's exterminations were carried out less from ferocity than from policy; he did not kill, like other of the Terrorists, for the love of killing, but because he saw no other way of maintaining himself in power. When the Marquis de Ségur ventured to remonstrate with him on his complicity in the massacres of September, Danton replied: "Monsieur, you forget to whom you are speaking. We are of the *canaille*, we come from the gutter; with ordinary principles of humanity we should soon be plunged back into it. *We can only govern by making ourselves feared.*"

How He Lived.

Rather than be plunged back into the obscurity whence he sprang, Danton was, therefore, ready to sacrifice anybody and everybody who might possibly dislodge him from the position of ease and affluence he had acquired. It is idle to seek in him any exalted desire for social regeneration; he wanted to enjoy the good things of life and that was all. In this matter, Danton was, of course, not unique; feasting demagogues were the order of the day under The Terror. Even those who professed, as Danton did not, the doctrines of Socialist equality made no attempt to carry these principles into practice. The orgies of Barère at Clichy, the luxury and splendour of the pro-consuls in the provinces can only find a parallel in ancient Rome. Chaumette, whilst declaring that the French people should sustain life solely on potatoes, freely indulged in his favourite *vin d'Aï*, and it was Hébert, "that sage, that Puritan, that defender of the poor, who supped joyously in the evenings with bankers and army contractors." Indeed, with the exception of Robespierre, it would be difficult to find a single revolutionary of the period who made the least pretence of modest living. "Yes, I declare," Larevellière-Lépaux said to the Convention, "that I shall not cease to show up these tyrant brigands who, well lodged, well fed, well clothed, living in pleasure, affect such pity for the fate of the poor, work themselves up so furiously against all who enjoy some degree of ease, and call themselves pompously by the name of the *Sans-Culottes*."

An Opportunist.

The *grand seigneur de la Sans-Culotterie*, as Garat called Danton, was thus no worse than many others, but his example had more far-reaching effects. For, whilst such creatures as Hébert, Chaumette, and Barère are almost forgotten by posterity, the legend of Danton is still carried on with undiminished ardour, and the great-hearted patriot is represented as a noble contrast to his rival Robespierre. This is, of course, absolutely contrary to the traditions of true Socialism. The Bolsheviks of Russia for once proved faithful to their avowed principles in banning a play on the death of Danton lest it should prove offensive to the memory of Robespierre. For, to the consistent Socialist, it is the "Incorruptible" above all other of the revolution leaders who represents the principles of his creed.

But to the Radical or Socialist Opportunist who desires no reconstruction of the social system, but simply a redistribution of wealth and power which will tend to the advantage of himself and of his

party, the austere Republic of Robespierre presents no attractions, and it is Danton who symbolises his true aspirations. For Danton was the incarnation of the spirit of "Ote toi de là, que je m'y mette!" which Socialists describe as the essence of Radicalism. It was he who, better even than Mirabeau, demonstrated the art of appealing to the gallery, of using class hatred as a lever to one's own elevation, and, above all, it was he who originated the convenient theory of the bottomless purse of the State which adds so greatly to the charm of life for bureaucrats. "Get yourself given money, and do not spare it," said Danton to Garat, "the Republic will always have enough!"

Danton thus remains the supreme model for demagogues. Nor does his downfall act as a deterrent to his emulators. Danton, if he had only played his cards better at the end of his career, might well have lived to become a Comte under the Empire.

M. Mathiez, speculating on the persistence of the legend that surrounds him, sums up the truth in one illuminating sentence: "Who cannot see that in lavishing indulgence on the Dantons of the past, the security of the Dantons of to-day is assured?"

COMMUNIST TERRORISM.

AN EXTRAORDINARY PERSECUTION.

We have all heard of the "Great Terror" in France during the first Revolution. We all know something of the terrorist methods of the Republicans in Ireland. But probably few people realise that similar methods are being used to-day here in England by the Socialists, Communists, and Syndicalists. They do not use revolvers, as the Republicans of Ireland are in the habit of doing. Their weapons are of three kinds: financial, legal, and physical—of the club order.

First, men who are opposing Communism are offered bribes. If this is not successful, the law is misused in order to discredit or dispose of dangerous opponents of the Revolution. Finally, there is physical force, which is being freely used to intimidate or disable men in the trade union movement who have shown themselves to be the active opponents of Communism.

Throughout the engineering crisis all these methods of terrorism have been freely used. Trade union delegates who are known to oppose the policy of a general stoppage have been threatened; warned not to attend meetings, or it would be the worse for them. Many have been actually attacked in a most brutal manner. In several cases they have received terrible injuries, and have even been maimed for life. A still more cowardly method has been adopted in some instances. Finding that the trade union delegate himself could not be intimidated, they have struck at him through his home. I know cases where the wife of a trade union official has been attacked, brutally maltreated in the street, and even her little children injured. In other cases their houses have been entered and wrecked. This terrorism is systematic, and yet, in most cases, it is almost impossible to obtain a legal remedy, because these outrages are almost invariably carried out by men unknown to the victims. Gangs from Poplar and other parts of the East End, as well as from other Communist strongholds, are organised for this work. Some are aliens, and they are, as a rule, roughs of the unemployable type, but not always. Some appear to be artisans who have become followers of one or other of the revolutionary groups. These are not isolated cases. They have occurred in every great city from London to Glasgow, and this terror is carried on by semi-secret organisations with practical immunity under the very noses of the police, who, in most cases, are powerless to protect the victims.

Bribery and Corruption.

During the engineering crisis the bribery of trade union officials has become wholesale. The Vigilance Committees, which normally are without funds, have been provided with ample money from some mysterious source or sources. In London alone during the incessant trade union delegate meetings which have been held, tens of thousands of pounds have been distributed in sums varying from £5 to £500. These payments are made secretly, and generally in Treasury notes which cannot be traced, but cases are known where much larger sums than these have changed hands in the case of the more prominent men in the Labour movement. In trade union circles it is generally believed that this money is coming not only from the agents of the Third International, but also from some German source, which possibly utilises the Irish Republican organisation for a distribution of these funds. If this view is correct—and trade unionists are generally remarkably well-informed in regard to these matters—it would appear that there must be some working agreement between the Russian Communists and some German organisation which is interested in bringing about the disruption of the Empire.

Trumped-up Charges.

But the most insidious and in some ways the most dangerous form of terrorism which is being employed is that of the misuse of the legal machinery of the country in order to harass or discredit the opponents of Socialism or Communism. Within the last few months men have been arrested on trumped-up charges of so serious a character that bail was refused, and so have been detained for a week or more in custody so that they were unable to attend meetings where it was known that they would oppose the revolutionary programme. In one notorious case at least a man was arrested by a person who produced forged credentials, and by the time inquiries were made and the fraud was discovered, the trade union meeting which he was to have attended was over. The Lunacy Acts have even been employed, and opponents of the revolutionaries have been accused of being mentally unbalanced in order to discredit them or to get them shut up in an asylum, so that they should be out of the way until the revolutionary plans matured. There can be very little doubt that in some cases of the misuse of the legal machinery of the land, Socialists or Communists in certain Government Departments have worked in collusion with the revolutionary organisations. What is needed is a vigorous combing out of all Government Departments, so that all Civil Servants who are using their position to further the cause of Socialism or Communism should be got rid of and our public departments be cleansed. There is abundant evidence that in some of these departments there is a serious leakage, and that the Labour Party and Communists have their agents and sources of information, which not only keep them informed of what is going on in those departments, but are utilised to further Socialist aims. It is time that this widespread organisation for the subversion of the country was broken up, and that the conspirators, whether "Reds" or so-called "moderates," were once and for all dealt with in the interests of the whole nation.

G. G.

HOW GERMANY OUGHT TO PAY.

By E. T. GOOD.

The theory that Germany cannot pay, or ought not to pay because payment would be detrimental to our side, will not stand the test of scrutiny. If Germany had won the war she would—despite Ludendorff's comic statements in the *Sunday Pictorial*—have known how to make us pay, and there would have been no talk in Germany about reparations or indemnities being detrimental to that country.

It is argued that Germany can only pay by or through exports, and as the goods Germany can export are of precisely the kind we ourselves desire to make and sell, such payments must damage our industries. This is not true, as we will see in a moment; but let it be at once remarked that those who tell us we cannot receive German products without loss of employment for our own workers are the people who before the war, when the fiscal controversy was on, told us that the more goods we imported from Germany the better off we were; that "dumping" was a good thing for us; that, as imports had to be balanced by exports, the more cheap goods we got from Germany the more of our own products we should be able to sell in the world's markets; and that on no account should we penalise or restrict our imports of German goods. Now that it is suggested that Germany might pay for the war by exports we are told that such a method of payment must injure our industries.

Germany produces, and could send to us, various materials which we require. To begin with, Germany is not a poor country. In agriculture Germany is four times richer than Great Britain. The last German census showed 9,750,000 actual workers employed in food production, against our 2,250,000. Germany has three times as much land under the plough as we have, and she gets as much food from 40 acres as we get from 100 acres. Germany's forest wealth is fully fifty times greater than ours. In coal and iron ore Germany is nearly as rich, after the reversion of the Lorraine, as Great Britain is, and the economic position of Germany is such—her food-producing resources, for instance, are such—that she does not need to export nearly so much coal or manufactured iron to balance food imports as we do. In actual steel-producing capacity Germany is ahead of us. In chemicals and other lines Germany is far more naturally productive than Britain. Germany went through more than four years of war on her own internal resources. We could not have lived four months without heavy imports. To-day Germany has no unemployment problem. Her mines and machines are going at top speed. We have 2,000,000 unemployed. Germany is investing almost fabulous amounts of money in works extensions, in reserves of industrial raw materials, and she is paying huge dividends and granting extended trading credits, whilst our manufacturers can barely pay their rates and taxes, and are losing big foreign orders because they cannot afford to grant extended credits. Germany is winning the peace because we are failing to make her pay for the war.

In this matter our blundering statesmanship is illustrated in the case of scrapped munitions. Germany was required to scrap immense quantities of munitions, munitions steel, and munitions machines. Instead of the scrap—a tremendous quantity of high-grade alloy and other special steels, etc.—being reserved for the manufacturing industries of our side, it was left in Germany. It has afforded cheap and abundant and superior raw material for the German manufacturers and engineers. It has been melted down and re-rolled, and easily converted into a thousand and one light steel and engineering products, which have practically wiped similar British goods out of the world's markets in these last two or three years. Whilst ordinary scrap steel in this country has been as much as £12 a ton, superior munitions scrap has been almost a gift to the manufacturers and engineers of Germany. And now, to crown the blunder, whilst our electric steel furnaces, specially built during the war to melt scrap, are standing idle, the British Government is supplying Germany with 200,000 tons of steel warships to be scrapped and feed German furnaces.

How much longer are we going to be humbugged by Germany—and by our own incompetent statesmen? Before the war we were told that the more cheap German manufactures we got whilst our own men stood idle the better it was for us. Now we are told we cannot receive German payments without robbing our own people of employment. Before the war we were told that the Kaiser was a man of peace. We could disband our Army and scrap our Navy for anything the peace-loving Germans would do. When war did break out we were told that Germany could not feed herself many weeks. When the fighting ceased we were invited to pity the poor Germans and send them food and materials. And ever since the Armistice we have been told Germany cannot, and must not, pay. Rubbish!

Germany could pay in certain raw and semi-raw materials. This method would not injure our industries. It would help them. First, there is wood, a very important industrial material of which we produce very little. We need wood for house and ship building, for furniture making, for pulp for paper making, and many other uses. The German-made war sent the price of wood up enormously. We are paying excessive prices for wood through Germany's action. Germany destroyed great forest areas in Poland, Russia, France, and elsewhere. But not an acre of Germany's rich forests was touched. Germany is exceedingly rich in timber. Thirty per cent. of her area is covered with rich forest. Germany has had a scientific forest policy for generations. Germany's vast timber wealth has been vastly enhanced by the war. Why not require Germany to send us and our Allies so many millions of tons of timber annually till the war is paid for?

Next, there is fuel—coal, coke, and lignite. Germany is being required to deliver certain quantities of coal—20,000,000 tons a year—in part payment of the damages she did to the collieries in

France, Belgium, and elsewhere. Our statesmen would not have thought even of this method but for a Press campaign in its favour. However, the contribution is small and inadequate. The total tonnage of reparation coal stipulated for only amounts to two-thirds the pre-war tonnage of Germany's exports, and is miserably meagre compared with the industrial damages Germany has done. Germany destroyed pits, she destroyed furnaces, she created a famine in many things requiring coal for their production; but Germany is intact, and she is let off with a slight penalty. Germany is left with as much coal as any other country of a similar size. She ought to be deprived of the bulk of her coal, and left to employ herself chiefly in agriculture.

The same remark applies to iron ore. Germany, after the loss of the Lorraine, holds as much iron ore as the United Kingdom. She ought to pay part of the indemnity in iron ore, and so be left with less for converting into steel for another war. Germany ought to pay heavily in wood, coal, and ore.

Then there are such things as potash, chemicals, industrial spirits, and alcohol. Potash is a good fertiliser, and Germany is capable of making 1,000,000 tons a year. She ought to send half that tonnage to our side. During the war Germany, on the admission of her own statesmen, converted no less than 25,000,000 tons of potatoes a year—half her huge crop—into spirits for war purposes. Make her convert such quantity into spirits for the peaceful industries of our side. Germany has vast chemical-making resources. In these things—wood, coal, ore, spirits, chemicals, and potash—Germany could pay.

PROPAGANDA IN AMERICA.

Mr. Gompers has issued an anti-Bolshevik manifesto at Chicago, in which he remarks:—

"It is impossible to violate confidence, but I am going to make here certain statements on this point, for which I have ample proof.

"First—the Bolshevik propaganda fund in the United States amounts to many millions of dollars, partly in cash deposits and partly in old crown and nobility jewels.

"Second—bribes have been offered out of this fund, bribes have been offered in places where the American people can ill afford betrayal.

"Third—the newspaper world, to which we must look for information, is worm-eaten with Bolshevik friends and propagandists and still further eaten into by immature reporters and editors who fall victim to deception or blandishment.

"Fourth—as a result, editorial understanding is offset by a great volume of misreporting and pro-Bolshevik reporting.

"Fifth—foreign correspondents are to an amazing degree addicts of the Bolshevik dope habit, evidenced at the moment by obviously tainted cables from Genoa.

"Sixth—most important is the espousal of the Bolshevik cause by the group of American-Anglo-German bankers who like to call themselves international financiers to dignify and conceal their true function and limitation. Specifically the most important banker in this group, and speaking for this group, born in Germany as it happens, has issued orders to their friends and associates that all must now work for Soviet recognition."

It will be noted that Mr. Gompers confirms the revelations of Mr. J. H. Thomas.

LETTERS OF A PATRIOT.—IX.

Sir,—In that most admirable book, "Ordeal by Battle"—written by Mr. F. S. Oliver in 1915 to show the necessity for conscription—the author points out that the British Empire had invited attack, because its vast possessions and its claim to be a first-class Power were quite inadequately supported by its organised military forces. Lord Roberts had said in 1912: "Such an Empire invites war. Its assumed security amid the armaments of Europe is insolent and provocative." It will be remembered how our politicians abused Lord Roberts for trying to open the eyes of the people to the visible danger; and how our Haldanes and many lesser lights apologised to Germany for the provocative language of the ex-Commander-in-Chief, who had given repeated warning that "*Germany strikes when Germany's hour has struck*," and that with our Territorial Force unorganised and unequipped, some form of National Service was necessary for security. The striking arguments in "Ordeal by Battle" were all justified by the course of the war and by the adoption of conscription; but it was only by the mercy of Providence (and our wonderful "Contemptibles") that we were spared the destruction of France as a Power and our own later ruin, while the politicians were wasting time from fear of speaking plain truths to the nation. A Cabinet Minister, Sir John Simon, in November, 1914, told the country that "one volunteer was worth three pressed men, and the Kaiser already knew it."

This harking back to a war-time book can be defended, I think, by the state of our present foreign policy. We are undertaking to put the world right; to justify self-determination of several chaotic nations; to accept mandates; to readjust frontiers; to plant one race in the midst of another; and to warn some peoples not to commit atrocities, while ignoring the most atrocious crimes committed by others. While taking this insolent world attitude, we are busy cutting down our fighting forces and putting our splendid fighting-men on the street; so it must be assumed that our rulers think the noble international objects we have in view will be our shield amongst the still quarrelsome nations we are instructing. We are not even a united nation with the potential strength of unity to fall back on; for the people who took advantage of the war to pursue special political aims have grown largely in numbers as a single anti-patriotic party. From these conditions it is of the first importance that the organised fighting power of the nation should be in proportion to the magnitude of the national foreign policy; but this will be called flat *Militarism* by those who use the word as a reproach. In the Agadir crisis with Germany, when our Government had made a sudden display of backbone, the *Daily News* proclaimed: "The time has come to state with a clearness which cannot be mistaken that Sir Edward Grey as Foreign Secretary is impossible."

Happily for our future, the majority of our people are sounder than the talkers and the writers, and are to be counted on when events enforce plain truths; the war proved it; but, as Mr. Oliver says, "a certain type of politician has been evolved, and has risen into prominence—a type which does not trust the people, but only fears them. They have darkened the eyes and drugged the spirit of the nation." When it is asked who could replace our present indispensables, the sufficient reply is, any honest patriotic group willing to trust the people, and to act on the principles of equal justice and freedom, enforcement of the law, and observance of the Ten Commandments.—Yours faithfully,

A. P.

UNREPORTED CONVERSATIONS.

III.—CHARLES JAMES FOX AND TOM PAINE.

"Which is it to be, Tom—port or brandy?"

"Brandy for me, Mr. Fox. One nip of brandy makes the whole world kin. Have you ever studied the connection of Spirits with Revolutions? When I was over in Paris the other day Marat told me that they'd never have got the people to Versailles if Orleans hadn't distributed brandy."

"There was rum *in*board before the tea went *over*board at Boston, wasn't there?"

"So I've heard; but that was before I crossed. First-rate tipple this! As an ex-Exciseman, I know brandy from *brandy*."

"I must introduce you to the Prince, Tom. He's very grateful to you for helping Washington and Franklin score off Papa. George is capital company. If all princes were like him and Orleans, I shouldn't be a Republican. You should sympathise with George. He, too, has had a religious father."

"But not a Quaker, Mr. Fox."

"Was your father a Quaker, Tom? I shouldn't have suspected it. Thou art not a Quaker exactly."

"Only when I'm in Pennsylvania; elsewhere I'm a Voltairean."

"That's the religion for Republican grown-ups! Years ago I visited the Patriarch himself at Ferney. No renounce or denounce the Devil about him and his apostle, Frederick."

"Very free and easy in his language, wasn't he? You must have benefited from his stable talk."

"Not particularly. You see, I had a good father, who taught me to rattle the bones before I went to Eton."

"You Aristos have all the luck. Till I ran away to sea, I was kept at making stays, hoeing turnips, and reading the Bible."

"Made stays? That's very interesting. Did you try them on the ladies, Tom? You were a sly puppy, I'm afraid."

"Mr. Fox, unlike yourself, I have always had a high regard for women. In America I wrote up the Rights of Women."

"Did your wife accompany you to America?"

"When I was dismissed from the Excise and sold up, we separated. That the fault was hers, and not mine, is proved by the letter of introduction Franklin gave me to his brother-in-law. He called me an 'ingenious, *worthy* young man.'"

"The late lamented Benjamin wasn't, however, a Joseph. Let me see. You reached America just before the Dawn of Freedom. I don't want to flatter you, but, unless I'm very much mistaken, your 'Common Sense' and 'Crises' did more for us than Washington's rather blunt sword?"

"I've certainly more skill with my pen than he has with his sword, and, if I hadn't induced Louis the Fool to lend him the two and a-half million livres, he would never have captured Cornwallis."

"I hope you were well remunerated for your services, Tom."

"Do you consider a few thousand dollars and a couple of hundred acres of confiscated land adequate payment for founding a Republic?"

"Is that all you received? Cromwell and Essex had lands worth thousands of pounds a year, and my grandfather, for saving Charles II., after Worcester, pocketed at least a quarter of a million. If I turn Pitt out of office I'll see what can be done for you. Considering your efforts for us, the State ought to be as generous to you as it will be to Adam Smith for writing 'The Wealth of Nations.'"

"We found 'The Wealth of Nations' very useful on our side of the Atlantic."

"Quite so. Adam has worked out Voltaire's ideas very well. If your 'Rights of Man' sends Billy to the sponging house, you shall have Daylesford."

"Will Hastings be condemned then?"

"Not unless Pitt is cleared out. If Pitt gets his marching orders we shall send Farmer Jarge to Bethlehem and the Prince will pack the House of Lords with New Whig Peers."

"Shan't we have a Republic?"

"You're looking too far ahead, Tom. The public hasn't yet forgotten Cromwell. Under the Prince we shall be just like France is now—a Republic all but in name. How's 'The Rights of Man' progressing? I had a letter the other day from Anacharsis Clootz, complaining of Burke's rubbish."

"I can't for the life of me understand why Burke, who did such good work for us across the Atlantic and tried to free India, came to write that bosh."

"Yes, to call Orleans, Mirabeau, and Lafayette 'persons of quality who have betrayed their trust' is arrant drivel. Hit him hard for that!"

"I suppose I'd better stick to Lafayette and not mention Mirabeau and Orleans. They are—er—a little—what shall we say——?"

"You forget, Tom, you're writing for the masses. To them Mirabeau is a musical word spelt with a capital, and Orleans a town. Besides, both of our friends are very decent fellows. Link them up with Clootz and his Embassy from the Human Race. Clootz may be a Prussian Baron, but his name suggests manual labour. It will appeal to artisans and farm labourers. You haven't overlooked the passage in which poor old Burke predicts that the government of France will shortly fall into the hands of thieves and adventurers"

"How shall I deal with that, Mr. Fox?"

"Call attention to Burke's nationality and origin and tell him not to generalise from himself. Hint at his dealings in East India Stock."

"He may reply that I'm an adventurer."

"So you are, Tom. But your answer is simple. The American Revolution has hardly paid your expenses, and you are the honest mechanic who invented the iron bridge exhibited this year at Leasing Green. Have another go at the bottle, while I turn up Clootz's letter. . . . Ah, here it is. Clootz wants particular notice to be drawn to and ridicule poured on Burke's prophecy that the Revolution will lead to a military dictatorship."

"Is that good policy, Mr Fox? Have people here forgotten Cromwell?"

"Trump Cromwell with Washington. But, perhaps, it would be better, eh? not to refer to the paragraph. Another drink? No! Well, goodbye. You will send me the proofs. . . . Funny that I, who served under and with Lord North, should have to consort with such canaille. If I weren't so infernally extravagant and unlucky, I would give Burke a helping hand."

THE GENOA FIASCO.

"ALLIED UNITY IS AT AN END."

BY W. FAULKNER.

What Mr. Garvin calls "The Drama of Genoa" is now ended, and the "star" performer has returned home. The dutiful organs of Downing Street have given us full reports, illustrated by photographs of the elaborately organised *spontaneous* welcome home of the Premier at Victoria Station on Saturday last. Liberal and Unionist supporters of the Coalition assembled on the platform to show their gratitude to the man who has brought "peace" to Europe! I was amused by a conversation I overheard between two M.P.s who, while waiting for the arrival of the Great Man, were discussing the Prime Minister's difficulties and achievements at Genoa. One said to the other: "Well, he has had a very hard struggle, but he has succeeded in getting the peace pact accepted while further investigations are made by the Commissions, and this means peace in Europe until next spring—that is, for nearly a year! That is something, anyhow, to be grateful for, and justifies the Premier's efforts at Genoa." This wonderful achievement was the theme of the Downing Street organs on Saturday and Sunday. The temporary peace pact has given the Coalitionists as much pleasure and joy as they derived from the pact with the Irish Rebels. I noticed on Saturday, however, that many of them were rather worried over the news from Ulster in the evening papers. It seemed to restrain the exuberance of the Premier's admirers.

It would have been interesting if we could have had, while waiting for the return of the Wizard, the views of his Bolshevist friends upon the results of the Genoa Conference. I would like to have introduced Comrades Chicherin, Radek, and Sosnovsky to the Unionist supporters of the Premier. Their interpretation of Genoa is not quite in harmony with the panegyrics of the Coalition Press. Sosnovsky, in an article written specially for the *Communist*, 13th May, describes Mr. Lloyd George talking at Genoa "like a Communist propagandist at a street-corner meeting." But this talk did not take in Chicherin, says this comrade. He replied in a way that disturbed the harmony of the Conference, and

> There might have been a free fight. . . . But the old and cunning wolf—I beg pardon, the old and cunning sheep—Lloyd George, arose to allay the storm.

In this style Comrade L. Sosnovsky ridicules Mr. Lloyd George and his Conference. The *Communist* of the same date remarks in reference to this Russian Comrade's letter from Genoa:

> We wish to add a comment of our own upon the adroitness of Chicherin and our other comrades. The spectacular success of the Rapallo Treaty is really a minor matter. What the Russians have succeeded in doing is to break up the Allied unity. All was ready. The Supreme Council was gathered together, and the criminal Bolsheviks summoned to hear their sentence and be intimidated by the moral sternness and imposing unanimity of the judges. Not a week passed before baits alternately held forward and withdrawn, the Shell oil concession rumours set about and then stopped, had turned the bench of justices into a cockpit. The most reverend signors have forgotten their dignity and their need for a moral unity against Sin, and have started biting and scratching each other.
>
> Allied unity is at an end. Now it is a helter-skelter scramble for the concessions Chicherin waves before them. Each donkey is running for its carrot, and now the Russians can practically make their own terms.

An official review of the Genoa Conference, written by Karl Radek, has been sent to the organs of the Communist International. It is a long article, and it was published in full in the *Workers' Republic*, organ of the Irish Communists, on 13 May. Space will permit of only one or two brief extracts from this article. Radek explains that the Russian Soviet "is the result of the first wave of the world revolution." Now the Bolshevist must wait for the next wave, which will carry the revolution into Western Europe. In the meantime, the Soviet Republic must consolidate its position, and this will necessitate admitting foreign capitalists to Russia in order to reconstruct the industrial life of Russia. The Soviet will not under any circumstances restore private property, but it will make concessions to capitalists in the form of leases. The capitalists will pay the Soviet a rent for the right to manage, and to make a profit out of, these industries. The Soviet Government will, however, retain "the levers for the control of national economy in its hands." The meaning of this restriction is given by Radek in the following statement:—

> And after the removal of the necessity for the importation of industrial products from the foreign capitalists in order to raise the production of the Soviet Republic, the Soviet Government can gradually attempt to obtain control of the entire field of large industry.

The policy of concessions is only necessary "as long as the European working class does not free it (the Soviet Republic) from the pressure of world capital. Therefore, we call the struggle now going on at Genoa a decisive struggle—a struggle for the existence of the Soviet Republic." Radek adds:—

> The capitalist world is attempting to utilise the period between the first wave of the world revolution and the next to drive the proletariat from the position which it now occupies, and which will facilitate its further advance. And the resistance offered by the delegation of the Soviet Government means the holding of a barricade until new reserves come up.

This is the Bolshevist view of the negotiations at Genoa. There is no desire for peace on the part of the Soviet, and it does not intend to keep any peace pact a day longer than is necessary to serve its revolutionary purpose. Radek shows this very plainly in the conclusion of his long article in the *Workers' Republic*. He describes the diplomats' meeting at Genoa, and who—

> lispingly exchange friendly words, every second one of which is a lie. Mr. Lloyd George is addressed as Right Honourable by the Soviet Delegation, and the Soviet Delegation is treated by Lloyd George as if it consisted of gentlemen according to the ideal of London City. But all this is only the deceiving external picture. . . . In Genoa the representatives of two classes are negotiating. And these negotiations in the splendid conference chamber in well-chosen, polite words are no different from a fight with arms in the hand. The duty of every class-conscious worker during these decisive weeks is the rousing of an understanding for all this in the masses of the European proletariat and the mobilisation of these masses for the support of the Russian Soviet delegation.

If the Coalitionists will study the Bolshevist Press they will see that any victory connected with Genoa belongs to the Germans and the Bolshevists. Genoa is as great a fiasco for this country as the Irish "peace" settlement. The rejoicing of the Coalition organs is premature.

THE OUTLOOK IN IRELAND.

The levity with which the Lord Chancellor treats the present situation in Ireland—he recently tried to laugh the whole thing down as an "addiction to paradox" or as a scene from a comic opera—such an attitude, if nothing else, would make the debate "live long in our memories" as a confession of the "depths of humiliation to which a British Government had fallen."

"The very weakness of the Provisional Government," said the Lord Chancellor, "is a sign of its strength and was bringing in support," and he added that the result of the elections would be a large if not overwhelming majority in favour of the Free State. This last statement is in almost the words of our leading Free Staters, and is made on their authority. It has always been only too common in Ireland to take those things for granted which we want to happen, and, *vice versâ*, the views of an opponent are the delusions of a fool. Sufficient, perhaps, to add that the Republicans express an equal confidence.

The Balance of Power.

On the one side, then, there is the statement of the Lord Chancellor, supported by the Free Staters, and on the other (leaving out of consideration the Republican view) the reports coming from residents in many parts of the South and West that the Republicans are supreme and do not intend to recede from their position in any way, while it is in these parts that outrages—not mere "illicit and sporadic" violence, but wholesale brigandage and anarchy, that, coupled with the expropriation and exile of everyone suspected of loyalty—are most prevalent. These facts, taken with the failure of the Provisional Government to give protection or even attempt to govern the country (though, according to Mr. Collins, the restoration of order would "not be civil war, but merely a police measure"), and the continued occupation by the Republicans of prominent buildings in Dublin and elsewhere, discount the superiority in numbers the Free State holds.

The Coming Elections.

Speculation as to the rival positions is almost useless, yet it becomes more doubtful whether an election can be held. In this connection the proceedings of the Committee to devise means of peace are interesting. If the Free State has, as is said, practically the unanimous support of the country, it is hard to see why they so eagerly desire to come to terms with a party representing at most 10 per cent. of the population, instead of adopting its own suggestion, "that it should ordain terms of settlement by virtue of its sovereign power and enforce them on all parties." Yet they propose, by means of an "agreed election," to evade a contest, because, in their opinion, a contested election "might be attended by civil strife," which might result in "the worsening of our national position." It has been common ground from the beginning that the Treaty should be submitted to the electorate, and the Free State (Agreement) Act provides that "as soon as may be such steps as may be necessary" should be taken for holding an election for the twenty-six counties. The evasion of a contest seems a hardly conceivable proposition if the Free State majority is as great as is said, while the proposals put forward are tantamount to a confession that the Provisional Government cannot guarantee a free and unfettered election.

The End in View.

It is by no means easy to fathom the exact meaning of the reports presented by the Committee, but it would seem that by an "agreed election" it was proposed to constitute a new Dail with a pro-Treaty majority by the nomination by Sinn Fein of candidates in the proportion of five to three or six to four in favour of the Treaty, and that a Coalition Government should then be formed. There is, of course, the magnanimous but utterly worthless offer made by both sides that any other party might be entitled to contest the election against the "national" candidates. As long as the Sinn Fein organisation remains the arbiter of the destinies of the country, as it would under this arrangement, the ideal remains unchanged, if not of an actual Republic, at least of a completely independent Ireland. The statement made in the House of Commons that—

> it is desirable that upon the authority of an election the Republican idea should be definitely and completely put aside. Adhesion to the Treaty as a result of an election will finally disestablish the Republic, which is an idea foreign to the Irish mind,

and the views expressed by Ministers as to the anxiety of the Irish signatories to bring this result about, at once appear as what they are, namely—fudge.

"Our Revolutionary Government."

Mr. Collins recently said, "If this peace conference fails, there will be no other. Every avenue of co-operation will have been explored, and we shall have to take strong action to restore order." The desire for compromise is still strong on both sides. As was suggested in the Dail, in the last resort, to avoid fratricidal strife, they should unite against Ulster. If such a settlement comes, the recent attitude of the Free Staters shows that it must be an advance towards a Republic. It is noticeable that Mr. Collins now speaks of the Provisional Government as "our Revolutionary Government," an ominous term for a Government established by the law of the land. Not merely do the pro-Treaty election posters try to prove that the Free State and the Republic are identical, but the *Free State*, the organ of the pro-Treaty party, which, now that it has been quoted by Mr. Chamberlain in the House to prove the good faith of the Irish signatories, may be regarded as a legitimate authority for their views, says :—

> If Sinn Fein realism had been kept unimpaired since the Treaty, we might by now have had a Parliament functioning with all the authority of the people behind it, and using its power to extract the last ounce of liberty from England. We might have already begun to be a far stronger disintegrating force within the Empire than without it. The result has been a state bordering on anarchy, with individual greed and passion rising stronger every day. A spirit is settling down upon the people which will soon drive them to hate bitterly all Republicanism and all force, and may render a national movement impossible for a generation.

Again :—

> We are not such pessimists nor have we so little faith in our countrymen as to imagine for a moment that, having secured national, economical, and individual freedom by the Treaty they will fail to push forward to the complete realisation of their national ideal. It is possible for Ireland, if she accepts the Treaty, and it will not take her so long as it took Norway and Bulgaria to accomplish complete separation. With faith in ourselves and our destiny we in Ireland can do what they have done.

And again :—

> The wording of the Treaty undoubtedly waives on behalf of Great Britain any claim to a clear and unequivocal statement from Irish Parliamentary representatives that they acknowledge the sovereignty of the British Monarch or the

British Government, of which he is the nominal head and symbol.

The common citizenship of Great Britain and Ireland plainly does not mean that Irish citizenship will be merged in British citizenship and that every Irish citizen will as such become a British citizen or subject.

Steadily Worse.

These extracts throw ridicule on the assertions so often made by Ministers as to the good faith and resolution of the Irish signatories. It was said of the Free State Bill in the House of Commons :—

If you want to see Ireland degenerate into a meaningless welter of lawless chaos and confusion, if you want to proclaim to all the world week after week that the British Empire can get on just as well without law as with it, delay this Bill.

Since the passing of this Bill, which was to give the Free State the legal power to govern the country, conditions have become steadily worse; so much so that the Imperial Government is at last compelled to take cognisance of it, and even Mr. Chamberlain is disturbed. Yet the day of salvation has now been further postponed till the elections—a very doubtful date. When the elections have passed and nothing comes from them, it will be interesting to see what further date will be chosen as the starting-point of peace and prosperity. Mr. Chamberlain said :—

The time has come for the Provisional Government to exert themselves actively, resolutely, and at every cost to give protection to the citizens, and show not merely their good faith and their desire to keep the Treaty, but their power to do so.

Mr. Collins, in reply to a deputation from the Church of Ireland, said much the same, that the Government would ensure civil and religious liberty, and would not countenance spoliation or confiscation, adding, of course, that the whole troubles were due to the outrages in Belfast. The question may well be asked when are steps going to be taken to bring about this state of things. Patience is being rapidly exhausted; every day that is allowed to pass makes the attempt to restore order more difficult, and very soon it may be too late.

The Red Flag.

In addition to the ordinary forms of lawlessness, the Bolshevist menace is steadily increasing. The Red Flag had already been hoisted over businesses on a small scale; now the largest creamery business in the South has been seized, apparently under the authority of the Transport Union, and its branches in the local towns are in the hands of the workers. Violence is being offered to the farmers who supply it, who now declare :—

We have experienced the coercion of landlordism in the past, but such coercion as is being attempted on our members in the name of liberty was never experienced in the worst history of our country.

In its agrarian form, the seizure of estates, the division of lands, and the confiscation of stock continues unabated; the tenants of unpurchased holdings have insisted on a 50 per cent. reduction of the rental pending a new purchase arrangement on these terms; the payment of purchase annuities is withheld, throwing the payment of interest on land stock on the general body of the taxpayers. In a midland town the local council having refused an increase of wages to roadmen, the Transport Union officials with a body of men turned the Council out, constituted themselves the Council in the name of the Workers' Republic, and passed a resolution confirming the increase.

"'Convey' The Wise it Call."

An interesting document has been published by a branch of the I.R.A. drawing a nice distinction between Bolshevism and ordinary robbery, which says :—

We have seized certain estates and castles to be held by groups of men of our local units and to be so used by them; it is to be understood that our Army is part of the wealth producers of the country with right control of what they produce. These seizures were not only justified but justice-compelled acts.

Looting and theft, on the other hand, is regarded as hooliganism, and merely copying the worst features of the times.

On the anniversary of the execution of Connolly the Communists made a loud outcry for vengeance to be obtained by the speedy and bloody overthrow of the capitalist class and state, the Government of the exploiters, which is the "Free State, the Provisional Government, the tool of British Imperialists," and the establishment in its stead of a Workers' Government.

Mr. Churchill—Prophet.

Mr. Churchill said :—

No people in the world are really less likely to turn Bolshevist than the Irish. In a peculiar sense they are the most sure and unyielding opponents of the withering and levelling doctrines of Russia.

He evidently disregarded the infallible guide in Irish politics that the unexpected always happens, and it may be remarked, that the same thing could have been said of Sinn Fein during its early struggle for existence, yet it survived and dominated the whole country as Bolshevism will do unless strong and immediate measures are taken to establish some form of Government which will put an end, once and for all, to the idea now prevalent that armed robbery and confiscation is the easiest means of gaining a livelihood. It is true to say of Ireland at present that any idea would prevail that was supported by an armed and determined system of terrorism, and that is what Bolshevism, with the support of Republicanism, is doing to-day whether the native genius is opposed to it or not.

The Ostrich Policy.

The attitude the British Government is likely to adopt as to enforcing the terms of the Treaty is shown by an answer of Sir H. Greenwood in the House of Commons :—

So far as the forces (he said) of the Provisional Government were concerned, His Majesty's Government were satisfied that the intention of the Treaty had not been departed from.

Yet, when asked how it was possible to tell if the Free State was keeping within the limits imposed by the Treaty, if the number of their forces was unknown, he was unable to give an answer. It thus seems that as far as the British Government is concerned, the interpretation of the Treaty is to be a matter solely for the Free State, and that the Government will be satisfied with anything that is done, provided that the nation, which is, after all, the other contracting party, can be kept in the dark as to what has happened. Then, when the Empire is faced with those dangers which Ministers have said *ad nauseam* were inevitable if further concessions towards separation were granted to Ireland, it will be a small matter to say that it is too late to undo what has been done and that the Empire must endure its "fundamental existence" being imperilled.

The British Side of the Question.

It is, after all, not now an Irish question. Ireland will take years to recover from the ruin which has come on it since the Treaty. It has become a question of the safety of the United Kingdom and Empire, and it is for the British public to see that their own security is not endangered by such haphazard and irresolute proceedings on the part of their Government.

INCIDENTS OF THE IRISH TERROR.

A fugitive from Dunmanway, County Cork, told this tale: "There was an old gentleman, over eighty, living there. The Shinners came and called him to the door. 'Shure, you wouldn't kill an old man like me,' he said, and his old wife begged for his life. They dragged him out, shot him on the doorstep, and flung his corpse back into the hall. All that night we heard the poor old woman's screams all through the town; 'twas dreadful to be hearing her."

Mr. Higgins, ex-R.I.C. and agent to the Prudential Insurance Company, lived in New Ross, Wexford, in peace with his neighbours, until May 6, when his house was attacked at midnight. He and his son escaped through a window at the back, hoping that the wife and young children would be spared. It availed not. Soon after two little children fled in their nightdresses into the garden, and the raiders opened fire on them. One of these little girls, aged ten, is paralysed through terror, and will probably be a life-long invalid. But this was not enough. Time after time the house was raided and wrecked. Mrs. Higgins was put on her knees, and a revolver pressed against her head, to force her to disclose her husband's hiding-place. One of the sons, a mere boy, was taken away, placed against a tree, and threatened with death; but neither wife nor son would betray the head of the family.

And then, at last, the whole family were got out of the country. They are here, in England, their home and effects destroyed, their little savings gone, nothing left but the R.I.C. pension of £69 a year.

Three months ago A. B. was a prosperous man. He had an excellent and growing business as a general merchant, a good house and other real property; trade stock worth some thousands of pounds, a good connection and a good character. To-day only his character is left. He has been hunted out of Ireland: his house, shop, and stores are empty; his property is at the mercy of any marauder. At the lowest figure his losses amount to £16,000; he owes money to the wholesale merchants, but he has no means of collecting the money due to him.

D. M., a young man, was disbanded from the R.I.C. and returned to his father's house, where his wife was living. The day after his return the Commandant of the local I.R.A. and some of his staff visited the house. "You were in the police," said the Commandant, pointing a revolver at M.'s forehead; "I am going to shoot you." Instantly M. dashed the revolver aside and bolted in the woods which came close to the cottage. He never went back, but fled to the nearest railway station and made his way to England.

Extracts from a letter just received from Ireland: "You will be surprised to hear that Sergeant —— (R.I.C.) was shot on Saturday night. He was sitting in the kitchen, and a fellow broke in the door and shot him. His wife is very bad and not able to get out of bed, and last night ——(a labouring man and ex-soldier) was brought out and shot. He suffered a lot, and after some time died. . . . The shop is a wreck. The night the two shops were burned the village was black with armed men. They would terrify you."

CORRESPONDENCE.

NOTE.—While inviting correspondence, the Editor takes no responsibility for the opinions expressed.

To the Editor.

A CHURCH OF ENGLAND CLERGYMAN ON "BOLSHEVISM."

Sir,—In the sixth of your excellent series of "Letters of a Patriot," I read the following sentence:

> Numbers of the clergy are no longer reliable defenders of the people against the doctrine of "Class Consciousness." They have been deluded by phrases and half-truths into the acceptance of a kind of sugar-coated Socialism which appears consistent with Christianity at first sight.

I have a letter written to me by a beneficed Minister of the Church of England, from which allow me to quote one or two extracts:

> Bolshevism, in principle, is sound.
>
> The principles of Bolshevism are those of the teachings of Christ.
>
> Bolshevism in its true and proper spirit has come to stay in England, not so much the political side of it, I mean, as the spiritual—the principles which have been drawn from and learned from the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. You must be converted to those principles.
>
> Bolshevism is what the world demands, and it does so because at heart it believes in the teaching of Christ and means to see more of it.
>
> The Christian aspect is growing in Soviet Russia!

In my reply I asked the writer how he could deliberately insult the intelligence of the mass of his countrymen by suggesting that such a loathsome, utterly un-Christian thing as Bolshevism had come to stay here. I advised him to repeat his view to his congregation from his pulpit, and to note how many of them remained in the church when he had finished; and, if he made such a statement from a public platform from which he could be answered back, he would be hissed off it; and recommended him to attire himself in a white sheet, to mount his pulpit and make his recantation to his flock.

I imagine this very stupid man, who nevertheless might do much mischief in his neighbourhood, knows nothing of the fact that since October, 1917, the inhuman monsters (mostly Hun Jews) who have misgoverned Russia, reducing the country to ruin and its people to starvation, have, through the diabolical Tcheresvychaika tortured and executed 1,776,000 persons, made up of 28 bishops, 1,215 clergy, 193,000 workmen, and 818,000 peasants, etc., etc. Heaven save the Christian Church from the teachings of such men as the parson above referred to!

I also have seen the prospectus of the anti-patriotic preparatory school referred to by A. P. in letter No. 6. I wonder whether such a school will celebrate Empire Day, and how?—I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) HENRY T. C. KNOX, late Lieut. R.N.

Seaview, 13th May, 1922.

THE RED DEATH.

A Clear View of Communism.

Sir,—The Labour Party, temporarily led in the present Parliament by Mr. Clynes, are admittedly bent on the destruction, gradually or violently, of the capitalist system of industry, and the replacement of private ownership and control by transfer to the coming "Labour" State!

A first step is acknowledged to be necessary in a "levy on capital" to weaken the position of the owners still further, and to this proposal Mr. Asquith is ready to give consideration, if not a qualified assent.

There is, of course, nothing new in these Socialist tendencies and "principles," if they can be fitted to any principle at all.

What is recent is the experience of the results of these "principles" when they are applied.

Russia abolished or destroyed capital and capitalists alike, while the State or aggregate of Soviets remained in being.

The result was the destruction of industry, followed by starvation on a scale which has horrified Europe.

In the heyday of the destructive stage the Russian Government, controlled by Lenin, quite logically declared war by every means against all Imperialist or Capitalist States.

This was logical, because such a movement could not stand still in one area, but was bound either to be crushed or to be universally extended.

Then came the crash, the starvation, and the rest of the obvious results.

A change was necessary, and acknowledged to be needed by Lenin himself.

Private ownership was again sanctioned, and the Capitalist States were applied to for help, for loans, for material of every kind, and for the rehabilitation of industry in Russia by grants from all European countries in proportion to their ability. The appeal was *ad misericordiam*, and readmission to the comity of nations formed part of the claim.

Can Mr. Clynes, or any of the leaders of the movement, from such whole-hoggers as Jim Larkin to philanderors like Mr. Asquith or Lord Robert Cecil, present any reason why the result of the confiscation of capital would differ in the British Empire from what has been secured in that empire which was once Russian?

The only argument that has yet seen the light has been the very candid one produced by Lenin—viz.: Partial or local anarchism is insufficient; the whole world must be drawn into the vortex of Nihilism, as otherwise Nihilism will be overcome.

When destruction is complete, and suffering has glutted itself, another system, not capitalist, must arise.

Lenin makes no pretence that the process will not involve hideous suffering for many years during its initial stages.

There is, of course, one reason why the outcome of this revolution would differ in the British Empire from the consequences entailed in Russia.

There could be no *volte face* half way, such as Lenin has made, no appeal for rescue from the world without.

With the British Empire in ruins, there would be no Power left to appeal to.

There would, of course, be geographical tracts known still perhaps as Germany, South America, or North America, etc., but as their wealth and power are bound up with their foreign trade, the destruction of the British Imperium would, by reaction, render them also helpless and impoverished. To estimate the truth of this we have only to assess the effects of the late war on the economical position of neutrals as well as combatants—on those who sacrificed in the field and those who did not—on those who were defeated and on those who nominally conquered—on those whose money exchanges far overtopped the normal—and on those whose currency depreciated to the lowest fraction.

On all alike fell the blight of paralysis of trade and prosperity.

The temporary disappearance of Russia from the commercial world has proved that such a defection cannot be tolerated without injury to the whole community of nations, and this with an empire whose resources were most imperfectly developed and whose flag was rarely seen on the high seas.

If, indeed, the problem is approached from another angle—viz., the inequality of reward to the various classes, from simple labourer to Emperor, we find ourselves faced with the result that in Russia the Emperor was murdered or executed, with many of his family; but the fullest effects of the Communistic revolution fell first and hardest on the poorest and most defenceless of the labouring masses. Kings and Emperors have in history been constantly assassinated, often by kinsmen, at other times by a palace cabal, at others by lunatics or eccentrics.

In these cases the masses have remained generally passive or unaffected

Destruction which aims at the paralysis of industry by the confiscation of the springs of its prosperity finds its first human victims in the lowest ranks of the multitude, that 85 per cent. of the whole who are fated by laws *not made by man* to labour with their hands, and whose prosperity depends on the effective output of their toil being secured to them.

Through what imaginary process any popular benefit can be secured by the destruction now outlined by revolutionists has never been explained, and can only be promised by the blind to the blind, and by neglecting or ignoring every teaching of experience.

OLD SOLDIER.

BUDGET SECRETS.

Dear Sir,—It should occasion no surprise that Sir Philip Sassoon possessed special knowledge concerning the Budget proposals.

At the time, he was entertaining Mr. Winston Churchill at Lympne; moreovor, he happens to be the Prime Minister's private secretary, and is naturally conversant with every move of State.

If, instead of a reduction in the tea duty, an addition had been proposed, its premature disclosure might have resulted in a great loss to the revenue, and the House of Commons should have recorded its disapproval instead of treating the matter so lightly.—Yours faithfully,

ERNEST S. BROWN.

London, E.C., 22 May.

SOVIET VIEW OF THE GENOA CONFERENCE.

Sir,—Just in case it has escaped your notice, I should like to call your attention to an announcement in the *Daily Telegraph* this morning, which runs as follows:—

"The All-Russian Executive Committee at its sitting yesterday considered the question of the Genoa Conference. There was no discussion on the question. M. Joffe, who attended the sitting, declared that the Genoa Conference was a big victory for the Soviet. It was chiefly due to the Soviet, he said, that the dissolution of the Entente was proceeding rapidly, and that it was becoming more and more obvious how unnecessary and unimportant the League of Nations really was."

We should all, I am convinced, feel extremely grateful to M. Joffe for this timely warning, if English people would only take it to heart. But it is surely reasonable to suppose that such statements as these, emanating from Bolshevist headquarters, may make some impression on that large body of thinking men, who have sincerely supported the Conference, and display a sublime disregard for the warnings of its opponents.

Yours, etc.,

Oxford, 19 May, 1922. J. P. W.

SOCIALIST SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

Sir,—May I draw attention to the following facts?—

(1) We have had a timely and vigorous exposure of the methods and objects of the various kinds of "Red" or "Socialist" schools.

(2) This campaign has (happily) created a strong public opinion adverse to the above institutions.

(3) Right-thinking people rejoiced to learn of a pending Bill which(it was hoped and believed) might mean drastic action *re* this menace.

(4) To-day—with disappointed surprise—we hear that the said Bill proposes neither to "encroach on the liberty (!) of Socialist Sunday Schools" nor "the teaching of 'Socialist doctrines of a constitutional (!) nature.'"

It is claimed that "bodies representing 7½ millions of people support this measure."

The situation, therefore, is this:—

That this vast number of well-meaning Britons finds itself pledged—by its support of the Bill—to "profess" (? "pretend") that, in its opinion Constitutional (?) Socialism" is *not* simply "camouflaged Communism," and, further, that, while it *is* right and necessary that there should be "encroachments on the liberty of the breeding-grounds of Atheism and Anarchy *on weekdays*, such "encroachments" would be wrong and unnecessary *on Sundays!*

To me the whole thing seems not only anomalous, but intolerable. And may I ask any "competent authority" just to inform me (*a*) Whether it is attributable to accident or design? and (*b*) What, if anything, can be done in the matter?

I enclose card, and am

Yours, etc.,

22nd May, 1922. "KAT'S EYE."

THE NEED FOR THE TRUTH.

Sir,—It is no earthly good our foreseeing the doom of England and the coming of the Anti-Christ. Let us rather put our shoulders to the wheel and stamp out this fiendish menace, whether it be in the Press, Labour and Church, or amongst the millionaires or middle classes. Let everyone tell everybody else the truth. We learn that the American Labour leader is crying out against the spreading of Bolshevism by Jew bankers. It is quite evident that certain of our Press are trying to lay the sole blame on Germany. This is not so. I myself have discovered that Socialism is being taught by well-to-do Englishmen, who are the conscious or unconscious victims of a Jewish propaganda. A "noble lord" of the Press stated that the extremists of the Labour Party were as stupid as the Tory extremists. I suppose that remark was made because what he called the Tory extremists were those in possession of the Press that told the truth. At the same time, all loyal Englishmen must see that the loyal and truthful Press is not pushed to the wall by any section of the Press that receives unlimited funds.

H. W. W.

Torquay, 9 May, 1922.

THE PATRIOT

No. 16.—Vol. II. 25 MAY, 1922. PRICE SIXPENCE.
Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper.

THE PATRIOT.

Copies of THE PATRIOT can be obtained either through the usual agents or direct from the publishers:

THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, WHITEFRIARS STREET, LONDON, E.C.4.

Single Copies, 6d.; or 7d. post free.

Terms of Subscription:—
3 months, 7/6; 6 months, 15/-; One year, 30/-.

The Publishers can supply Vol. I, bound in cloth, 13 issues, complete with Supplements, at 15/-

DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND'S FUND.

The following Publications can be obtained free on application from the

PUBLICITY DEPARTMENT,
THE BOSWELL PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO., Ltd.,
2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.

LIST OF PAMPHLETS.

The Conspiracy Against the British Empire.
The Truth About the Coal Strike.
The Revolutionary Aspect of the Miners' Strike.
Some Leading Facts of the Conspiracy Against the British Empire.
The Plot Against Trade Unions.
The Plot Against Britain (By John Briton).
The Attack on the Empire.
The Government's Irish Policy.
(Speech by the Duke of Northumberland at Newcastle on 29th October, 1921.)
The League of Nations (By John Briton), with introduction by the Duke of Northumberland.

LIST OF LEAFLETS.

The Coal Strike. What is Behind it?
Patriotism. } Extracts from articles
Appeal to Conservatives. } in THE PATRIOT.

BOOKS TO BE READ.

PRICE.

Democracy at the Crossways - 15/-
Author—F. J. C. Hearnshaw. Publishers—Macmillan & Co.

The Red Light - - - - 2/6
Author—Ernest E. Williams. Publishers—Freedom Association.

Disloyalty - - - - - 6/-
Author—Harold Owen. Publishers—Hurst & Blackett.

Unpopular Opinions - - - 6/-
Author—Harold Owen. Publishers—Erskine Macdonald, Ltd.

The French Revolution - - 21/-
Author—Nesta H. Webster. Publishers—Constable & Co., Ltd.

The World Revolution - - 18/-
Author—Nesta H. Webster. Publishers—Constable & Co., Ltd.

The World at the Cross Roads - 12/6
Author—Boris Brasol. Copies from The Britons, 62, Oxford Street, W.

The Coal Crisis - - - - 1/-
Author—W. Livesey. Publishers—Simpkin Marshall.

Labour Trusts - - - - 6d.
Author—T. Rich. Publishers—Boswell Printing & Publishing Co., Ltd.

The Great Conspiracy - - 2d.
Author—Oldstock Ryder.
(Copies can be obtained from The Boswell Co.)

Surrender to Murder.
Author—Stephen Frewen.
(Copies can be obtained from The Boswell Co.)

LABOUR TRUSTS

Their Pretensions, Their Methods and Their Influence on the State.

By THEODORE RICH.

A Trade Unionist writes: "I can heartily endorse every word."
A Prominent Engineering Employer: "Straightforward hard hitting."
An Expert in Industrial Finance: "Is admirable in every way."
Engineering: "Would deserve to be reproduced in full."

Price 6D.

Copies on application to
THE BOSWELL PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,
2, Whitefriars Street, E.C.4.
Telephone: CENTRAL 2109.

By Post 7D.

Published by The Boswell Printing and Publishing Co., Ltd., 2, Whitefriars Street, London, E.C.4.
Printed by St. Clements Press, Ltd., Portugal Street, Kingsway, W.C.2.